

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the allegedly Admitted Prior Art taken with U.S. Patent No. 5,107,176 to Endo et al. (hereinafter “Endo”).

Claims 3-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the allegedly Admitted Prior Art taken with Endo as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,686,933 to Okada et al. (hereinafter “Okada”)¹.

Claims 9-15 are allowed.

Claim 2, while objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1-4 to differently describe embodiments of the instant application and to improve the form of the claims. Applicants have canceled claims 5-8 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants have added claims 16-20 to differently describe embodiments of the instant application. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 9-20 remain pending for consideration.

¹ It appears that this portion of the Office Action is in error because claims 6, 7 and 8 are dependent on claim 2, which is indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Thus, it appears that the rejection of claims 6, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is in error. Nevertheless, Applicants have now canceled claims 6-8 without prejudice or disclaimer.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the allegedly Admitted Prior Art taken with Endo. Claims 3-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the allegedly Admitted Prior Art taken with Endo as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Okada. Claims 5-8 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejections of these claims moot. Moreover, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 3-4 to differently describe embodiments of the instant application and to improve the form of the claims. To the extent that these rejections might still be deemed to apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 has been newly-amended to describe a plasma display combination that includes a plasma display module including “a plasma display panel; a driving circuit for driving said plasma display panel in response to driving voltages supplied thereto thereby causing said plasma display to perform its display operation on the basis of said image signal; and an inside power circuit driven by an external alternating current, for producing said control voltage for controlling operations of said interface board and said auxiliary source voltage, said inside power circuit being controlled to supply said driving voltages to said driving circuit in accordance with said inside voltage source control signal supplied from said interface board.”

Applicants respectfully submit that by the provision of such an arrangement as described above, and as recited in newly-amended independent claim 1, the plasma display module according to an embodiment of the subject invention includes an inside power circuit that requires a large capacity and a high output voltage in order to drive a

plasma display panel. As shown in Fig. 3 of the instant application, the inside power circuit according to this embodiment of the subject invention is capable of producing a control voltage for controlling operations of an interface board which is supplied with a source voltage supplied from an external power circuit. The inside power circuit according to this embodiment of the subject invention is capable of producing an auxiliary voltage which is supplied to the external power circuit for its operation.

Applicants respectfully submit that, according to this embodiment of subject invention, the inside power circuit is thus able to be provided integrally with the plasma display panel and is also able to be designed only for the purpose of the plasma display panel which is a high voltage and high capacity load. The inside power circuit is provided separately from the external power circuit which is only required to energize the interface board for processing an image signal. The interface board is usually constituted by an integrated circuit (IC) and therefore is a relatively low voltage and low capacity load.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that a plasma display panel according to embodiments of the subject invention greatly facilitates the overall design and manufacture of the composite plasma display apparatus including not only the plasma display module, but also the interface board that supplies an image signal to the plasma display module.

Endo teaches a "driving IC 14 which receives an external display signal and causes corresponding display cells to emit light" at col. 1, lines 43-65, in a portion cited by the Office Action. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the external display signal supplied to the IC 14 in Endo differs from the external power voltage because

Endo's IC 14 causes the corresponding display cells to emit light.

In embodiments of the subject invention, as discussed above with regard to independent claim 1, the external power circuit (6 in Fig. 3) produces a source voltage (V_x) which is not a display signal such as that associated with Endo's IC 14. Applicants respectfully submit that Endo's driving IC 14 does not correspond to the interface board but rather corresponds to the driving circuit 3 for driving the PDP panel 2 shown in Figs. 1-3 of the instant application. Accordingly, it is apparent that Endo does not properly cure the deficiencies of the allegedly Admitted Prior Art in the manner asserted by the Office Action.

As a result, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither the allegedly Admitted Prior Art nor Endo, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1, as amended. MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that "[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent claims 3-4 are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claim 1, the reasons set forth above, and also because the additionally applied reference to Okada fails to cure the deficiencies of the allegedly Admitted Prior Art and Endo, as previously discussed.

Moreover, claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 is also allowable at least because of its dependence on independent claim 1, as amended, and the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection

to claim 2 is respectfully requested. The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 9-15 are allowed.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 16-20 to differently describe embodiments of the instant application. Claims 16-19 are allowable at least because of their dependence from newly-amended independent claim 1. Moreover, new claims 17-20 are allowable for similar reasons as discussed above with regard to independent claim 1.

Change of Correspondence and Associated Papers

Applicants notes that a Change of Correspondence Address, Change of Attorney Docket Number, and Submission of Revocation of Original Power of Attorney and Grant of New Power of Attorney were filed in this application on November 9, 2004. These papers appear on the electronic file wrapper for this application on the USPTO website. However, the Change of Correspondence Address, Change of Attorney Docket Number, and Submission of Revocation of Original Power of Attorney and Grant of New Power of Attorney appear to not have yet been processed by the U.S.P.T.O. because the Office Action dated November 12, 2004 was incorrectly forwarded to the previous correspondence address and the new attorney docket number has not been indicated on the Office Action. Moreover, the public pair site has not been updated in this regard as of February 11, 2005. **AS THESE MATTERS ARE OF SIGNIFICANT IMPORTANCE, APPLICANTS REQUEST SPECIFIC CONFIRMATION BY THE EXAMINER THAT THESE ISSUES HAVE BEEN ATTENDED TO WITH**

THE NEXT OFFICE COMMUNICATION. The U.S.P.T.O. is invited to contact the undersigned in the event that any questions remain on these issues.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the timely allowance of this application. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP



Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

Dated: February 11, 2005

By:

CUSTOMER NO. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202-739-3000
Fax: 202-739-3001